

## DRAFT MINUTES

### FSA Science Council

#### Final Draft Minutes of the Sixth Plenary meeting: 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019

**Location:** Wellington Hotel, Wellington Suite, 71 Vincent Square, London, Greater London, United Kingdom, SW1P 2PA

**Attendees:** See Annex 1

**Materials:** Agenda and meeting papers<sup>1</sup>

#### Summary of Actions:

Number	Action	Owner	Deadline
Action Dec-19-1	Secretariat to update Science Council Register of Interests and members to inform Secretariat of any changes.	Secretariat	17 January 2020
Action Dec-19-2	Secretariat to publish the draft minutes as final of the 5th meeting on 27th June.	Secretariat	10 January 2020
Action Dec-19-3	Secretariat to establish when the Science Council will consider ACSS recommendations on best practice for risk communication.	Secretariat	17 January 2020
Action Dec-19-4	CSA and Council members to report on progress engaging with FSA and non-FSA advisory committees over the next 6 months.	FSA CSA/Council	24 June 2020
Action Dec-19-5	Head of SSCR Unit to share the summary documents of each team with the Science Council.	Secretariat	17 February 2020
Action Dec-19-6	Science Council to be regularly updated at Science Council open sessions and sought for opinion on the progress being made on Horizon Scanning.	Secretariat	24 March 2020
Action Dec-19-7	Secretariat to share Risk Analysis Board paper with the Science Council before the January FSA Board meeting.	Secretariat	17 January 2020
Action Dec-19-8	CSA to regularly provide the Science Council with updates on the National Food Strategy.	FSA CSA	24 March 2020

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://science-council.food.gov.uk/science-council-meetings>

## DRAFT MINUTES

Action Dec-19-9	Working Group 5 Chair to consider and share what support he might need from the Council.	Paul Turner	31 January 2020
Action Dec-19-10	Secretariat to update the Science Council on resourcing for Working Group 5 and timelines for delivery	Secretariat	31 January 2020
Action Dec-19-11	Secretariat to share a timetable of Science Advisory Committee meetings for the next calendar year with the Science Council and ensure all relevant documents are circulated by the SAC Secretariat to the appropriate Science Council Member	Secretariat	24 January 2020
Action Dec-19-12	Secretariat to review which Science Council members attend Science Advisory Committee meetings.	Secretariat	30 June 2020
Action Dec-19-13	Chair to write to the SAC's on new ways of working to seek opportunities, share insight and have more collaborative / efficient working.	Chair	30 April 2020
Action Dec-19-14	Secretariat to discuss with SAC Secretariats attendance of their members at future Science Council meetings.	Secretariat	29 February 2020
Action Dec-19-15	Secretariat to prompt Science Council members when expenses claims are due.	Secretariat	At least 1 week before the end of a financial quarter
Action Dec-19-16	Secretariat to circulate draft minutes to Chair within 2 working weeks of the meeting.	Secretariat	10 January 2020

### Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Science Council. She welcomed Guy Poppy (FSA Chief Scientific Adviser), Rick Mumford (FSA acting Director of Science), Adam Cook (Head of Science Strategy, Capability and Research Unit) and Elena Fesenko (FSA Science Strategy and Assurance Team). A full list of attendees is provided in Annex 1.
2. The Council's Register of Interests is published on its website. Members confirmed that they have no new specific interests to declare in relation to the meeting agenda.

### Action Dec-19-1: Secretariat to update Science Council Register of Interests and members to inform Secretariat of any changes.

3. The Chair noted that Mark Rolfe has been recruited to the FSA Board and will be standing down from the Council after this meeting. She thanked him for his vital

## DRAFT MINUTES

contribution in representing the consumer and local authority voice over the first three years of the Science Council. The Chair also paid tribute to the important contributions of Laura Green and Mark Woolhouse, who will both be stepping down from the Council after their terms are finished at the end of March. Both members set the Council on a sound footing with their leadership of Working Group 1 on Science Assurance and Working Group 2 on Risk, respectively. She thanked them for their dedicated service.

### **Agenda Item 2: Draft Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting and Actions Arising**

4. The draft minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019 were tabled for agreement. A draft had been circulated to members after the previous meeting and members' changes were reflected in this draft. The minutes were agreed by the Council.

#### **Action Dec-19-2 – Secretariat to publish the draft minutes as final of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June.**

5. Chun-Han Chan, the Science Council Secretary, informed the Council that all actions arising from the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting were complete aside from:
  - a. **Action Jun-19-2:** The Secretariat identifying cross-working opportunities with the Advisory Committee on Social Science (ACSS) has evolved into ongoing engagement with them, via ACSS representation on Working Group 5 and the Chair's attendance at ACSS meetings.
  - b. **Actions Jun-19-6 & Jun-19-7:** Update the Science Council on Risk Analysis and Horizon Scanning (respectively) by June 2020. An ongoing item but short interim updates to be provided by the FSA in Agenda Item 4.

### **Agenda Item 3: Science Council Chair's Report**

6. The Chair reported back on the three Working Groups that had delivered or are ongoing this year, noting how they represented the lifecycle of Council work.
7. On Working Group 3 the Chair thanked John O'Brien for representing her at the 19 June 2019 Board meeting where he presented the Science Council's recommendations on horizon scanning. She was pleased that these were welcomed by the Board, and that the FSA had made commitments to develop this function, noting the commitment to an annual workshop and the FSA Board's lead in strategic prioritisation of horizon scanning.
8. On Working Group 4, the Chair highlighted that the project had been delayed 6 months and that lessons that could be learnt for future Working Groups (such as Working Group 5) to allow more time to commission external projects. She had concluded that a concerted effort would be needed to this project to deliver on time.
9. On Working Group 5 the Chair observed that this may attract considerable attention as it is part of the FSA's wider response to food hypersensitivity and noted that the ACSS is closely involved. Working Group 5 is at the beginning of its lifecycle and a lot of groundwork has been done and it is important that Science Council and the FSA team manage this work together. Enough time should be scheduled for commissioning to ensure deadlines are not missed.

## DRAFT MINUTES

10. The Chair then discussed engagement with SACs and others by the Council. She had updated other SAC Chairs at their recent meeting on the work of the Science Council, and in future is looking to involve SAC chairs and members in Science Council work. It was important to anticipate where their involvement would be beneficial and arrange early engagement. The Chair noted a couple of items of interest from that meeting that:

- a. The FSA CSA will be the new Director of the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Strategic Priorities fund.
- b. ACSS recommendations about best practice in risk communication will be sent to the Science Council for consideration. The Chair asked the Secretariat to establish when this would take place.

**Action Dec-19-3 – Secretariat to establish when the Science Council will consider ACSS recommendations on best practice for risk communication.**

11. The Chair thanked Paul Turner for his attendance at a recent Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (ACNFP) workshop and John O'Brien for attending a recent Committee on Toxicology (COT) meeting and the FSA symposium on social science in Cardiff and the FSA Data Hackathon.

12. The Chair remarked that she was pleased about the close working relationship which had developed between the Council, the FSA Board and the FSA team. It is important to see that the Council's work has impact. The Chair also noted the improved engagement with SACs and asked members to consider what further engagement with other SACs might look like.

13. The Council noted that engagement might include non-FSA SACs with common interests (such as the Defra Science Advisory Council). The FSA Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA) Guy Poppy noted that he had discussed joint meetings of the Science Council with the Defra SAC with the Defra Chief Scientist (Gideon Henderson) and he felt any meeting should have a specific purpose.

14. Guy noted that there were also recent discussions about whether multiple committees across Government on single topics (such as pesticides) should be consolidated and where they should sit. The Chair asked for an update in 6 months' time on progress engaging with other SACs (FSA and non-FSA)

**Action Dec-19-4 – CSA and Council members to report on progress engaging with FSA and non-FSA advisory committees over the next 6 months.**

### **Agenda Item 4: FSA Update**

15. The Chair invited the Head of Science Strategy Capability and Research (SSCR) Unit Adam Cook, to update the Council on activities from the FSA and the formation of the new unit. Adam described the teams within the unit and the function they provide.

16. Adam highlighted the change in the Chief Scientific Advisors team name to Science Strategy and Assurance which was made to reflect the wider strategic work that the team undertakes.

## DRAFT MINUTES

17. The creation of the new Strategic Projects Team will have responsibility for strategic projects, national laboratory strategy and develop FSA's capabilities around Horizon Scanning.

**Action Dec-19-5 – Head of SSCR Unit to share the summary documents of each team with the Science Council.**

18. Adam went on to present the Areas of Research Interest (ARI's) questions to the Council. Emphasis was made that this would be a working document that would continue to change and that the high level 11 questions there would be supplemented by further detail.

19. Adam informed the Council that these would be officially published early in the new year.

20. Also presented were data on the impact that September of Science had made at the FSA. The presented statistics showed there had been increased engagement with science within the FSA as a result and SSAT would continue to monitor this.

21. Adam presented to the Council the work currently being undertaken on Horizon Scanning. The prior work and recommendations made by the Council was already being utilised within the team. The first test case and annual stakeholder workshop will be completed by June 2020 and outputs will be presented to the FSA Board.

**Action Dec-19-6 – Science Council to be regularly updated at Science Council open sessions and their opinion sought on the progress being made on Horizon Scanning.**

22. The Science Council was updated on the progress of the FSA Risk Analysis Process which was last presented to the FSA Board on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The FSA Board will be given an update at 21<sup>st</sup> January 2020 meeting.

**Action Dec-19-7 – Secretariat to share Risk Analysis Board paper with the Science Council before the January Board meeting.**

23. The Chair thanked Adam for his update and was content with the progress that had been made. The FSA Director of Science, Rick Mumford was invited to add any further comments.

24. Rick noted that EU-Exit will be the best test case for the new Risk Analysis process and that its 12 steps have been embedded at the FSA.

25. The Chair invited Science Council members to comment on the FSA update.

26. Paul Turner suggested that the process being defined for WG5 could be implemented within other Working Groups and more widely within the FSA. Rick agreed that this should be considered.

27. The CSA informed the FSA and Science Council that the FSA Board is interested in being involved in the Risk Analysis work.

## DRAFT MINUTES

28. Patrick requested that the FSA should consider the inclusion of data and digital within the remit of work. Adam indicated that this would connect with the horizon scanning work and that the FSA would welcome Patrick's involvement accordingly.
29. The CSA gave an update as per Action Jun-19-3 to the Science Council on the National Food Strategy. Emily Miles (FSA Chief Executive), Heather Hancock (FSA Chair) and the CSA had met with Anna Taylor (Chief Independent Adviser to Henry Dimbleby) to determine a way of producing a metric within the food system. Further conversations have been undertaken between other FSA colleagues and Anna on this topic, and this work will be ongoing. Henry Dimbleby (lead non-executive board member for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) has been invited to present to the FSA Board.

**Action Dec-19-8 – CSA to regularly provide the Science Council with updates on the National Food Strategy.**

### **Agenda Item 5: Working Group 5 on Food Hypersensitivity**

30. The Chair invited Paul Turner to report back on Working Group 5 (WG5). Paul said that a new approach to WG5 was needed to make it a more cohesive exercise. Paul Turner also tabled at the meeting a new version of the science assurance checklist to replace the version in Annex 3 of paper SC 6-5i. This is attached in Annex 2 of this minute.
31. He briefly went through the history of the FSA Food Allergy and Intolerance programme, noting that formal reviews had been completed in 2003, 2008 and 2012 but none since then. It is a broad ranging and complex research portfolio covering clinical science, social science and analytical methods.
32. He proposed a timeline approach, dividing the work into reviewing the past, present and looking to the future, as set out in the one-page summary in paper SC 6-5i, divided into the following tasks:
  - a. WG5.1: An internal FSA review of the FSA's allergy and intolerance research programme from 2008, which the Science Council will evaluate.
  - b. WG5.2: A research prioritisation exercise (using a modified James Lind Alliance (JLA) technique) using a nominal group technique to prioritise 10 key issues over the next 0-5 years.
  - c. WG5.4: A focused literature review of the issues prioritised in WG5.2 to establish evidence base and gaps.
  - d. WG5.3: A review of FSA best practice in using research and science. This will be interview led with specific case studies presented to the Council.
  - e. WG5.5: Horizon scanning workshop on food hypersensitivity, with a timeline of the next 5-15 years. This will use the other task outputs as supporting material and context for the workshops.

## DRAFT MINUTES

33. Paul noted that the FSA Chair was content with the timeline proposed for delivering Working Group 5's outputs. However, the timeline is still tight so FSA would need to assign a dedicated project manager to keep the work on schedule.
34. The Chair asked if the FSA was confident it could provide support needed to meet the proposed timeline. Adam Cook said he is looking now into resourcing this work and the FSA register of experts to support the work in WG5. The CSA noted that as this is an important piece of work for the FSA Board, necessary resource can be found. Laura Green was concerned that Paul as Chair of WG5 would be overworked so advice on how the Council could help would be helpful.
35. Due to the nature and complexity of this work it was agreed that face to face meetings were more effective to develop and deliver the outputs agreed.
36. **The Science Council agreed to endorse the revised plan of work and the new Terms of Reference for Working Group 5.**

**Action Dec-19-9 – Working Group 5 Chair to consider and share what support he might need from the Council.**

**Action Dec-19-10 – Secretariat to update the Science Council on resourcing for Working Group 5 and timelines for delivery.**

### **Agenda Item 6: Working Group 4 on Data Usage and Digital Technology**

37. The Chair invited Patrick Wolfe to provide an update on the progress of Working Group 4 (WG4).
38. Patrick has identified three issues for the FSA to address, to develop (i) culture and skill sets around digital and data across FSA, (ii) a uniform approach to data standards and data access, and (iii) assess what this means for the FSA and industry."
39. Patrick reminded the Science Council that two external pieces of work were currently being undertaken with the Alan Turing Institute and the Internet of Food Things (IoFT). The main updates were;
  - a. The work with the IoFT aimed to produce a Data Trust model across various industries with the FSA at the core. This work will be completed in June 2020.
  - b. The output of the project with the Alan Turing Institute would be a small-scale horizon scan on what data science tools are likely to emerge in the future. The final report will be submitted by the end of March 2020.
40. The Chair thanked Patrick for his contribution and commented that the output of this working group will be valuable to the FSA.
41. John O'Brien had attended the FSA Data Hackathon which highlighted the ways in which the FSA was trying to expand its data culture. He noted that there were cultural differences between disciplines in how data are used and how

## DRAFT MINUTES

collaboration across the disciplines can help pull together tools and data to develop solutions or to gain insight into a problem.

### **Agenda Item 7: The FSA Strategic Evidence Fund**

42. The Chair invited Elena Fesenko to give a short presentation on the FSA's Strategic Evidence Fund (SEF). The SEF is an agile fund created for the FSA Chief Scientific Adviser and designed to focus on emerging technology, emerging risks and collaboration and partnership, leveraging small SEF investments to seed larger research initiatives. It was noted the budget is projected to increase from £1.5 M in FY 19/20 to £2.1 M in FY 22/23. Management of the budget has been improved and a previous underspend has been addressed.
43. Looking to the future, the work of the SEF will be more closely aligned with FSA's Areas of Research Interest. It is also important to be able to show where SEF delivers a long-term strategic impact on the Food System, and how that can be measured. It can be hard to attribute change to strategic outputs of the kind this fund delivers. One possibility is using the theory of change to identify the kind of impact FSA wants to aim for and then design a strategy to get there. The Council were also asked how SEF can reach the best service providers.
44. Mark Woolhouse noted that the question of how to attribute change to research outputs is a universal one and UKRI, the Wellcome Trust or the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation may be able to provide insight for alignment.
45. John O'Brien asked if there has been a chance to see how SEF outputs impact longer term research. The CSA responded that SEF had not been running long enough to discern a pattern but that, for example, a SEF funded project identified evidence gaps around antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in microorganisms found in food and this prompted a larger AMR review funded by FSA Investment Board funds.
46. Sarah O'Brien said that for work in a new area (such as emerging risks or technologies) we should look for opportunities to consider newer or unknown contractors rather than working with the same contractors we know can deliver. However, delivery of quality research should not be sacrificed in our need to enrich the pool of potential contractors. It was also advised not to spend too much time on methods to attributing impact from SEF research, focusing instead on simpler indicators of change.
47. The FSA CSA noted that SEF is relatively new and has had to establish itself quickly to allow people to apply. Assurance and governance have previously been playing catch-up up to some extent, but SEF now has a robust and transparent management system. However, it is important that it continue to allow quick delivery and flexibility. Its agility as a fund has been a benefit and a balance must be maintained so it continues as a flexible and responsive fund with clear and transparent management.
48. Paul Turner warned that just because a fund is successful does not mean it produces good outputs, they may simply fund the same people who are practiced



## DRAFT MINUTES

at putting together impressive bids. As a fund SEF should be casting a wider net to attract contractors that can deliver results, not just the “usual suspects”. He encouraged interacting with early career researchers as recommended by Working Group 1.

### **Agenda Item 8: Update on FSA Scientific Advisory Committees**

49. The Chair invited both Paul Turner and John O'Brien to share with the Science Council their experiences from attending the meetings of the Advisory Committee on Novel Food Process (ACNFP) and the Committee on Toxicology (COT) respectively.

50. Paul had found attending the meeting both interesting and useful. He informed the Council that ACNFP will be taking on novel foods assessment post EU-Exit. He highlighted that he had been informed about the meeting rather close to the date and papers were not circulated to him.

51. John had also found attending COT's meeting interesting and that he was made to feel welcome. He emphasized that there were further opportunities to share information across all the SAC's.

**Action Dec-19-11: Secretariat to share a timetable of Science Advisory Committee meetings for the next calendar year with the Science Council and ensure all relevant documents are circulated by the SAC Secretariat to the appropriate Science Council Member.**

**Action Dec-19-12: Secretariat to review which Science Council members that attend Science Advisory Committee meetings.**

**Action Dec-19-13: Chair to write to the SAC's on new ways of working to seek opportunities, share insights and have more collaborative / efficient working.**

52. The Chair thanked both members for their feedback and contribution and underlined the value of close linkages between the Science Council and Science Advisory Committees.

**Action Dec-19-14: Secretariat to discuss with SAC Secretariats attendance of their members at future Science Council meetings.**

### **Agenda Item 9: Wrap up and close session**

53. The Chair thanked Council Members for their contributions and continued work. The Secretariat agreed to circulate draft minutes within two weeks of the meeting for comments.

**Action Dec-19-15: Secretariat to provide Science Council with reminders for when expenses claims are due.**

**Action Dec-19-16: Secretariat to circulate draft minutes to Chair within 2 working weeks of the meeting.**

DRAFT MINUTES

**Annex 1: Meeting Attendees Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

<b>Science Council</b>	
Sandy Thomas	Council Chair
John O'Brien	Council Member
Paul Turner	Council Member
Patrick Wolfe	Council Member
Mark Woolhouse	Council Member
Mark Rolfe	Council Member
Laura Green	Council Member
Sarah O'Brien	Council Member
<b>Food Standards Agency</b>	
Guy Poppy	FSA Chief Scientific Adviser
Rick Mumford	Director of Science
Julie Pierce (closed session)	Director of Openness, Data & Digital
Adam Cook	Head of Science Strategy, Capability and Research (SSCR)
Chun-Han Chan	Science Council Secretary
Paul A Nunn	Science Council Secretariat Lead
Alisha Barfield	Science Council Secretariat
Elena Fesenko	Science Strategy and Assurance Team, SSCR

**Annex 2: FSA Science Council Research: Research Checklist for WG5.1 and 5.3 (v.2)**

**1. Identification of research gap**

- 1.1. How was the research gap identified?
- 1.2. Was a comprehensive and systematic literature survey undertaken?
  - 1.2.1. Did this include a review of 'grey literature'?
  - 1.2.2. Were other sources of evidence such as surveillance or enforcement, or unpublished data from government, industry or other sources considered? Provide details where appropriate.
  - 1.2.3. What steps were taken to ensure that the data are reliable?
  - 1.2.4. How was the applicability of the available evidence to the UK assessed? Was there a need to consider different data sets for different regions of the UK, or for different groups of the population? How was this done?
  - 1.2.5. How were any areas of uncertainty handled?
  - 1.2.6. Was this process transparent?
- 1.3. Was the research question clearly defined?
- 1.4. What external engagement and review was carried out?
  - 1.4.1. What stakeholders were involved? How were these individuals/groups identified? Was there engagement with early-career researchers?
  - 1.4.2. Was non-academic input sought?
- 1.5. How was this process (of identifying the research gap) communicated, both internally and externally?

**2. Translation of question into appropriate methods that can answer the question**

- 2.1. How were potential methodologies assessed?
  - 2.1.1. What input was there from specialist research roles within FSA in defining the project?
  - 2.1.2. What external engagement was carried out? What stakeholders were involved? How were these individuals/groups identified? Was there engagement with early-career researchers?
- 2.2. Did the FSA use iterative approaches (e.g. sandpits, validated frameworks) when commissioning work in new research areas?
- 2.3. How did these inputs impact upon the final choice of tender?

**3. Commissioning and Procurement**

- 3.1. Was there a clear rationale for the research commissioned?
  - 3.1.1. How did this link to FSA objectives?
- 3.2. Who was involved in the commissioning process, both internally and externally?
- 3.3. How did the FSA ensure wide / impactful dissemination of research calls?
- 3.4. Was the appropriate methodology used to select the preferred tender? Was this process transparent internally?

**4. Conduct of the research**

- 4.1. How did the FSA ensure the research was undertaken as per specification and to time?
- 4.2. Was there input from specialists within FSA in managing the project?

## DRAFT MINUTES

4.3. How did the FSA manage any issues which arose during the research?

### **5. Analysis of Data and its Interpretation**

5.1. What input was there from specialists within FSA in analysing and/or interpreting the data?

5.2. What external review of the data was undertaken?

5.2.1. Was the scientific evidence base transparent to stakeholders?

5.2.2. Are data available for sharing?

5.3. Is it clear how the conclusion(s) are reached, based on the evidence?

5.3.1. Is the extent to which judgement has been used clear?

5.3.2. What is the quality (strength) of the commissioned evidence? How was this assessed?

5.3.3. Are the conclusions consistent with the published quantitative and/or qualitative evidence?

5.3.4. Are there any alternative interpretations of the same evidence?

### **6. Dissemination of findings**

6.1. How were the results disseminated?

6.2. Has the data been subsequently shared and used by non-FSA stakeholders? If so, how?

### **7. Implementation of findings / impact on policy**

7.1. Were all key scientific uncertainties, including gaps in the analyses and strength of the evidence, highlighted and expressed clearly?

7.1.1. What processes have been followed to assess this? E.g. GRADE EtD framework

7.2. Did the tenderer or FSA consider whether further research is required?

7.2.1. If the research was brand new or groundbreakingly, is there a need for corroboration by further studies?

7.3. What impact has the research had on practice and policy? What would trigger a review of any decisions made?

### **8. Review and learning mechanisms**

8.1. Has the success/impact of the study/programme been reviewed...

8.1.1. Internally?

8.1.2. By external peer review?

8.2. What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure changes are implemented in the future?

### **Annex 3**

#### **Note of Public Q&A Session**

The Chair invited questions from the members of the audience after the end of the formal meeting. There was one question from the audience.

#### **Alisdair Wotherspoon, Retired (former FSA employee)**

Alisdair was interested in the proposed methodology to develop new research priorities in the allergy and intolerance area. He noted that in his experience prioritisation is influenced by the choice of the various parameters and their weighting, and the choice of these can impact on the buy in to the outputs of people engaged in the process. He was also interested in how these priorities would then be considered against competing priorities from other areas of the FSA to achieve a final list. This could produce an opaque “shopping list” of research priorities that would emerge from the FSA business committee if the process is not clear.

He also noted that in his experience, it will be very important to involve possible funding partners from an early stage in the prioritisation process if it is hoped to develop cooperative/collaborative funding mechanisms.

In response Paul Turner highlighted that:

- For the WG5 prioritisation of food hypersensitivity evidence topics, a modified JLA method will be used which casts a broad net via a survey to identify outliers - issues that might not emerge when talking to already engaged stakeholders. A workshop steered by an external experienced JLA facilitator will ensure a validated process will be utilised to capture all points raised. However, the most important factor is that the process is completely transparent, so any omissions are apparent and can be addressed.

In response the FSA Chief Scientific Adviser highlighted that:

- The FSA wants to have a transparent approach to prioritisation using an objective method, but not one so rigid it loses expertise and subjective judgement. Being transparent is vital so those outside the process can see how it worked (a good example being NICE). He also noted on collaboration that Research Councils are becoming increasingly active in the food space with Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) growing its food safety work as it has links to its interests in food security.

In response Rick Mumford highlighted that:

- FSA is now starting to develop Areas of Research Interest (ARIs) to clearly show where our broad areas of research interest are and the ARIs are able to adapt and evolve as required. Openness is key and these ARIs are questions but are not specifically prioritised.

Alistair suggested that key stakeholders are involved in the conversation about priorities early as possible. If shared late in the process, they may reject them or no engage in discussion due to the perception of little opportunity for influence or chance.